

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections of the application.

Specification:

The Examiner is thanked for the reminder of the Abstract. However, it appears that the Abstract complies with the guidance set forth by the Examiner. If there is a specific problem with the Abstract, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify such a problem for Applicant's attorney.

Claim Objections:

Claim 1 has been objected to because of an alleged lack of antecedent basis for "the carrying axis". In response to that objection, claim 1 has been amended to provide antecedent basis in the preamble. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claim 8 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

The amendments to claims 1 and 8 are not intended to change the scope of any of the claims in the application.

Art Rejection:

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,305,496, hereinafter *Gagnon et al.* The Examiner alleges that the embodiment of *Gagnon* illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 corresponds to the present invention. However, the present invention, and in particular, as set forth in claims 1-10, is significantly different from *Gagnon*.

Specifically, *Gagnon* discloses a shock and vibration isolating caster which works by torsion. Specifically, torsion elements 70 are provided between plates 72 and wheel support plates 68 in order to provide limited torsion between the wheel support plate 68 and the fixed plates 72. As can be seen in the specification and drawings, the wheels 62 are mounted on a live axle 64 which rotates about axis 65. The axle 64 is secured in a hole extending through the support plates 68 and provided with a bearing to enable the axle 64 to rotate within the support plate 68. Both the mounting plates 72 and the torsion disks 70 have a slot 76 formed therein which can be seen in Figure 6. Accordingly, in *Gagnon*, the axle 64 is not connected to the plate 72, but passes through an arcuate slot 76 formed in the plate. In addition, the axle 64 in *Gagnon* forms the carrying axis of the wheel.

In contrast to *Gagnon*, in the present invention, suspension is not created by a torsion device. Suspension is created by a spring member. Furthermore, there are significant structural differences between the claimed invention and *Gagnon*. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the wheel support plates 68 of *Gagnon* correspond to the claimed hub body, the mounting plates 72 of *Gagnon* correspond to the claimed wheel mount, the axle 64 of *Gagnon* corresponds to the claimed supporting axle, and the axis 65 of *Gagnon* corresponds to the claimed carrying axis.

Without conceding whether or not the elements identified by the Examiner accurately correspond to the respective elements in the present invention, Applicant submits that *Gagnon* is simply different from the claimed invention. Specifically, according to claim 1, the supporting axle is provided on the wheel mount. However, in *Gagnon*, the axle 64 is not mounted on the plate 72 which the Examiner alleges

corresponds to the wheel mount. Instead, the axle 64 extends through an arcuate slot and moves freely with respect to the plate 72.

In addition, claim 1 clearly indicates that the supporting axle is spaced from the carrying axis of the wheel, whereas in *Gagnon*, the axle 64 is mounted along the carrying axis 65 of the wheel. Accordingly, at least these two elements of claim 1 are clearly not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.

Similar arguments apply to claim 10, wherein claim 10 indicates that the supporting axle is provided on the wheel mount and extends through the bore of the hub body so as to support the hub body and wheel, and further that the supporting axle is spaced from a carrying axis of the wheel. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, these features of claim 10 are also not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: January 5, 2005

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620